DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 199 95 EA 010 759

AUTHOR Rodman, Hyman
TITLE Poverty and Delinquency: A Theoretical Review.
INSTITUTION National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Hackensack, N.J. NewGate Resource Center.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 78
NOTE 37p.; Chapter 31 of "Theoretical Perspectives on School Crime, Volume I"; For other papers in this volume, see EA 010 729-768

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Theories; *Delinquent Behavior; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Economic Disadvantagement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Family Structure; Juvenile Gangs; School Vandalism; Social Class; Status Need; *Values

ABSTRACT

One of 52 theoretical papers on school crime and its relation to poverty, this chapter reviews the major cultural and structural statements on the relationship between poverty and delinquency. The value stretch perspective, stemming from research on family values and on aspirations is introduced in order to challenge and clarify the basic works of Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin, Miller, and Sykes and Matza. This analysis points out that further clarification is needed of the value modifications predicted for those living in poverty. Only then can hypotheses, stemming from alternative theoretical models of the etiology of delinquency among low income youth be tested. Containment and control theory is also included in the review, and incorporated into a theoretical paradigm that tentatively summarizes the literature on the etiology of male gang delinquency. The major elements of the paradigm deal with the community's limited ability to provide opportunities to achieve in accordance with the dominant values of society; the family's and the community's limited ability to maintain external controls over young people; and the family's limited ability to instill effective internal controls. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED157199

POVERTY AND DELINQUENCY:

A THEORETICAL REVIEW*

Hyman Rodman

University of North Carolina at Greensboro

A paper from
"Theoretical Perspectives on School Crime"

Submitted to
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
February 1978

Submitted by
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY
Hackensack, N.J.

* This paper is an updated revision of sections from Rodman and Grams (1967) and Rodman (1968). The assistance of Jay Mancini is gratefully acknowledged.

EA 010 759

ABSTRACT

This review focuses upon the major cultural and structural statements on the relationship between poverty and delinquency. It is evident that this area of delinquency field is characterized by theoretical stagnation, as exemplified by delinquency textbooks which continue to deal serially with several basic works written between 1955 and 1965. The infusion of theoretical ideas from other fields may contribute to renewed theoretical interest and advance. The value stretch perspective, stemming from research on family values and on aspirations, is therefore introduced in order to challenge and clarify the basic works of Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin, Miller, and Sykes and Matza. This analysis points out that further clarification is needed of the value modifications predicted for those living in poverty. Only then will we be able "cleanly" to test hypotheses stemming from alternative theoretical models of the etiology of delinquency among low-income youth. Containment and control theory is also included in the review, and incorporated into a theoretical paradigm which tentatively summarizes the literature on the etiology of male gang delinquency. The major elements of the paradigm deal with the following aspects of low-income community and family life: (1) the community's limited ability to provide opportunities to achieve in accordance with the dominant values of society; (2) the family's and the community's limited ability to maintain external controls over young people; and (3) the family's limited ability to instill effective internal controls.

Introduction

In the search for a theoretical explanation of delinquency, emphasis has been placed upon such independent variables as poverty, family functioning, personality adjustment, subcultural values, social strain, peer-group pressure, and situational variables. The widespread recognition of delinquency as a serious social problem, and of the adolescent years as a critical time in which to deflect an individual from a criminal career, have focused a great deal of attention on juvenile delinquency.

In this review, the focus is upon the etiological role of poverty or low socioeconomic status. For information on whether there is more deviant behavior or delinquency among the poor, the reader is referred to Rodman and Grams (1967), McDonald (1969), Frease (1973), Harry (1974), Kelly and Pink (1975), Chester (1976), and Flango and Sherbenou (1976). Although it is a critical question, that controversy will not be addressed here. Instead, assuming that some forms of delinquent behavior are more common under conditions of poverty, or that the etiological process is different under conditions of poverty, we will focus upon the theoretical statements that attempt to interpret the role that poverty plays

in generating delinquency.

There are theoretical statements that relate poverty to subcultural values, to social structural variables (e.g., strain, anomie), to family functioning, and to personality dynamics. These intervening factors are, in turn, associated with delinquency. This paper will focus primarily upon poverty theories which deal with subcultural and social structural variables. It should be noted, by way of introduction, that the theoretical statements oridinarily outreach the empirical data that are available, and that the richness of the theoretical debate has perhaps been due to the absence of data that can impose limits upon the theoretical imagination. It should also be noted that in the past 15 years there has been little theoretical progress (Miles, 1973; Gibbs & Erickson, 1975), and the consecutive snapshot discussion of a small number of "classic" works continues to be found in most textbooks.

An attempt will be made to break out of this theoretical mold by introducing a perspective that was developed outside the delinquency area. After outlining the positions of several of the major structural and cultural theorists on juvenile delinquency, I will introduce several ideas

that I have been developing in research relating poverty to family organization and aspirations. Although the empirical base for this new perspective is slender, it challenges the traditional theoretical positions, enlarges the grounds of discussion, and offers a way of resolving some of the theoretical controversies.

Status Deprivation

An important and pioneering theorist who deals with socioeconomic status and gang delinquency in structural and cultural terms is Albert K. Cohen (1955). According to Cohen, the delinquent gang arises from the interaction of boys with similar problems in densely settled areas. The basic problem of the working class or poor boy who becomes part of a delinquent gang is status deprivation. He lives in an environment in which the middle-class goals and values are emphasized but in which the possibility of actually achieving these goals by legitimate means are slight. Adolescents caught in this social means/end vise come together and develop patterns of gang behavior that serve to relieve some of their frustrations and permit them to achieve some self-esteem within the gang. Through a process of reaction formation the middle-class values

are inverted. The delinquent subculture therefore represents a shared "reaction formation" which serves to meet the patterned status deprivation problems of gang members.

One test of Cohen's theory would be to examine whether adolescents from working class or proverty backgrounds experience more status deprivation than do their more comfortable peers and whether delinquents experience more status deprivation than nondelinquents. Such a test has been carried out by Reiss and Rhodes (1963), who asked Tennessee schoolchildren if they thought that most of their fellow - students had better clothes and better housing. They found that the less affluent students more often felt status deprivation with regard to clothes and housing, and delinquents more often than nondelinquents. Many poor youngsters and delinquents, however, had never compared their clothing and housing with that of others. Reiss and Rhodes also found that students who attended a homogeneous (single-class) school more often felt status deprivation. They caution that their study--conducted with the school as a reference group and clothes and houses as status indicators--may not represent a fair test of the status deprivation hypothesis. They could not offer strong support for Cohen's theory; 72 percent of the delinquents felt no status deprivation

and the correlation between delinquency and status deprivation was low.

Although Cohen's theory has seen little empirical testing, it has provoked a great deal of theoretical consideration. Bordua (1961), in his excellent critique of the "subculture theories" of delinquency, commended Cohen's insistence that delinquent behavior is motivated, and that it does not result simply from the failure of the neighborhood, school, and family to control the slum boys. On the other hand, Bordua (1962) has objected to the emphasis Cohen puts on their internalization of middle-class goals and to the scant attention he pays to the importance of the family in producing delinquency among children. Cohen (1955, pp. 74-78) acknowledges that a child's early experiences are important, but, in disociating himself from a clinically detailed approach to a child's family experiences, he ends up giving little direct attention to family variables. Despite Cohen's comment that his approach "magnifies" the role of the family, his reference to "the position of the family in the social structure" is followed by a discussion of the social structure alone. In other words, the major role of the family is that it determines the child's social class position and thus subjects the child to particular

socialization experiences. The strength of Cohen's approach, amply illustrated by the influence of Delinquent Boys, is in its emphasis upon the problems and experiences typical of a given social class. The weakness is in its lack of attention to variations within a class, although Cohen and Short's (1958) subsequent discussion of different kinds of delinquent subcultures begins to address these variations.

Delinquency and Opportunity

Five years after the publication of Cohen's Delinquent Boys, Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin published Delinquency and Opportunity (1960) which presented another important statement on the connection between social class and delinquency. Cloward and Ohlin's theory had a predecessor in Robert K. Merton's (1957) discussion of the sociological causes of deviance. Cloward and Ohlin expanded this discussion to include consideration of the types of delinquent subsultures that several writers, notably Kobrin (1951) and Cohen and Short (1958), had observed. Essentially, Cloward and Ohlin's position is that adolescents whose path to culturally accented success goals--wealth and power--

is blocked by poverty and limited resources, but who simultaneously find illegitimate paths open, are the ones who become delinquent. The variations in illegitimate opportunity, the authors explain, result in different delinquent subcultures: much opportunity for participation in rackets of theft results in the formation of a semi-professional theft or criminal subculture; less opportunity for organized crime (in a disorganized slum, for example) results in the formation of a "conflict-oriented" sub-culture; lack of either illegitimate or legitimate opportunity may result in the formation of a "retreatist" (alcohol-or drug using) subculture.

Cloward and Ohlin's attempt to incorporate the development of various types of delinquent subcultures into their theoretical position is one of the strongest aspects of their work, and some evidence from studies of urban gangs tends to support their position. For example, Short and Strodtbeck (1965) found these three types of gangs in their study of Chicago delinquents, although that study is the only one which has reported finding a "retreatist" gang. Short and Strodtbeck, however, found little differences in the community back-ground within which the various types of gangs originated.

A study of differing slum communities in New York City, by Spergel (1964), found that each type of community had a different type of gang. In accordance with Cloward and Ohlin's theory, a "criminal" subculture was springing up in areas where racketeering and organized gambling flourished, while a "conflict-oriented" subculture was found in a disorganized slum area. However, Spergel did not find a "retreatist" subculture. Other studies of delinquents, in Britain, have not found the kinds of gangs described by Cloward and Ohlin (Downes, 1966; Mays, 1970).

Although Cloward and Ohlin's theoretical statement has made significant contributions to the study of delinquency, it has also come under justified criticism. One of its defects, according to several commentators, is that it ignores the family. Both Bordua (1962) and Matza (1964) have been critical of Cloward and Ohlin on this point, and Bordua (1961) also criticizes opportunity theory for ignoring the influence of a child's early development on his later involvement in delinquency.

Class Values and Delinquency

Another attempt to explain the high rate of delinquency among slum youth on the basis of social class, but one

which includes greater emphasis on the family, was put forth by Walter B. Miller (1958). Miller theorized that certain values or "focal concerns" of low-income-class people led to behavior which, according to middle-class standards, was delinquent. These "focal concerns' developed from the boy's position in two characteristic portions of his social environment: the female-based household and the single-sex peer group. Miller's identification of these values has been deservedly called "a masterpiece of cogent description" (Bordua, 1961, p. 128). Miller lists these "focal concerns" as trouble, toughness, smartness, excitement, fate, and autonomy.

According to Miller, low-income-class people show a pattern of concerns that differs from the patterns in other social classes. Under "trouble," for example, Miller refers to the concern about "getting into trouble" and "staying out of trouble," and suggests that these are major themes of life regardless of what choices individuals make btween law-abiding or law-violating behavior. Toughness, according to Miller, refers to men's concerns with strength, endurance, sexual conquests, and lack of sentimentality. These focal concerns are a description of behavior and values not unlike Cohen's (1955). But the link that Miller forges between behavior

and values leads him into difficulty. As Bordua (1961) suggests, Miller's theoretical problems come about because he derives his "focal concerns" from observations of behavior and then turns around to explain that behavior in terms of "focal concerns."

To this point, I have briefly reviewed the major structural and cultural statements about the relationship between poverty and delinquency. This material has become almost obligatory for reviewers, compilers, and textbook writers. I now turn to a theoretical perspective and to some empirical evidence that is not usually encountered in the literature on delinquency.

Controversies About Poverty and Culture

It is sometimes possible to gain better understanding of a topic by looking at it from a different perspective. This may be possible, in reviewing subcultural and structural theories of delinquency, by briefly considering the general controversies that have developed about the concept of a culture or subculture of poverty. Two descriptive questions lead us to the major controversy. (1) What are the norms and values within the poverty class? (2) Are they similar to or different from the norms and values within the society as a whole? If similar, then the evidence would point to a consensus on values, and

we would not have a separate culture; if different, the evidence would point toward class-differentiated values, and we could talk about a separate culture. In oversimplified form, these are the issues that lie at the heart of the controversy, and different social scientists, on the basis of limited empirical evidence, have taken opposing positions on the question.

Of course, the issues are not that simple, and the positions social scientists have taken are therefore not always clear-cut on the existence of a separate poverty culture. In the delinquency area, Miller's position on the existence of a unique value system among the poor which supports delinquent behavior stands in sharp contrast to other theorists who have viewed delinquency from the benchmark of middle-class values. Although there is some ambiguity in Cohen's (1955) position, basically he holds that these delinquents share middle-class values, and that their problems of status deprivation stem from their inability to achieve in accordance with these values. This leads to a reaction formation in which the middle-class values are inverted. It is to Cohen's credit that he is aware of the complexities of the issue and that he occasionally talks about the simultaneous internalization of both sets of values.

McDonald (1969) has summarized the issue with regard to the delinquency area:

> There are two theoretical schools providing explanations as to the source of working-class delinquency. One is essentially a culture explanation. It suggests that delinquency is one outgrowth of a life characterized by different values, norms and daily living habits. The other explanation, heretofore applied primarily to American society, is based on anomie theory. It suggests that working-class persons have the same basic values as middle-class persons, especially as they share an orientation to high achievement and a belief that they have equal opportunities for this. However, working-class people, after failing to achieve the goals by abiding by the rules, feel they must abandon the rules. They continue to strive towards the socially inculcated goals, but now by using delinquent means. (p. 20)

As I have pointed out elsewhere (Rodman, 1963, 1968), similar theoretical issues pertain to delinquency, marriage values, and aspirations. The controversy about the concept of a culture of poverty therefore has relevance for all these areas. Oscar Lewis (1966, 1968) introduced the concept, and it had a brief period of popularity. But a common critical reaction to Lewis's work pointed out the dreary list of negative traits that were said to be part

of the culture of poverty (Valtine, 1968; Leacock, 1971) and the use of the term waned. It is not sufficiently recognized, however, that the concept does not inherently lead to negative traits, but can also focus upon positive and adaptive traits as a response to poverty (Rodman, 1971). Moverover, the central issue of poverty's impact upon values remains, regardless of the concepts used--whether culture of poverty, or duality of values, or biculturality, or subcultures of poverty. All of these terms can suggest that poverty may lead to a greater complexity in the values of low-income people (see Rodman, 1971, pp. 7-12, 190-200).

The Range of Values

A general question about the complexity of values that has received relatively little attention has to do with the range of values that a person holds. A research tradition that focuses on the level of aspiration, for example, has contributed toward neglect of the idea of a range of aspirations and, by extension, of a range of attitudes and values (Rodman, Voydanoff, & Lovejoy, 1974). Shifting to another area, the question is not merely whether low-income people value marriage, but also whether they simultaneously value some other kind of marital relationship.

It is because of evidence that they frequently do value two such patterns simultaneously that I introduced the concept of a "lower-class value stretch" (Rodman, 1963). Of course, stretching one's values, or being committed with some degree of intensity to a range of values, is possible for any group or individual, regardless of social class.

The idea of a range of norms or values is certainly not new, but it can be raised in a way that offers a different perspective upon conforming and deviant behavior and attitudes. In some instances the range may not contain any values; in other instances the range may be very wide and may contain the dominant middle-class values as well as the values unique to the low-income class. Thus we can develop at least the following four categories:

1) Middle-Class Values - Low-income class individuals share the middle-class values and have not developed any alternative values.

2) Low-Income Class Values - Low-income-class individuals have abandoned the middle-class values and have developed their own values.

3) Value Stretch - Low-income-class individuals share the middle-class values and have also developed alternative values.

4) Pragmatism - Low-income-class individuals have abandoned all values in a particular area and act as directed by circumstance.

These four categories help to clarify the nature of some of the controversial issues centering around the poverty-culture concept, and they also point to the kind of data that need to be gathered.

Research on delinquency all too commonly neglects the possibilities of the above four categories. A general theory which acknowledges these value possibilities and which coordinates some of the contrasting positions about the values of the poor has been presented earlier (Rodman, 1963, 1966, 1971). Briefly stated, the basic assumptions and propositions are as follows: Poverty makes it difficult or impossible to achieve in accordance with the dominant values of society. This leads to behavioral deviation from the dominant values by the poor. In order to minimize negative sanctions, low-income individuals are likelier to stretch their values and to approve of dual sets of values. Because of this, poor people have a wider range of values, permitting them to bring their values into alignment both with their behavior as well as with society's dominant values (see Deutscher, 1973; Stokes & Hewitt,

1976). Not only is there a wider range of values, but a lower degree of commitment to any of the values in the range.

It is possible to test this value stretch theory in several different areas where the structural conditions make it very difficult for low-income individuals to achieve in accordance with the dominant values. Findings in the area of marriage values (Rodman, 1966) and in that of educational and occupational aspirations (Rodman, Voydanoff, & Lovejoy, 1974) support the theory of value stretch. Research by Gordon, Short, Cartwright, and Strodbeck (1963) also offers some support. They found that low-income boys, including gang delinquents, accept middle-class values as much as do middle-class boys; moreover, delinquent boys accept low-income values more than do other low-income boys, and the low-income boys accept them more readily than do middle-class boys. These findings seem to be in closer accord with the value stretch theory than with other interpretations of low-income-class or delinquency values. The findings of Siegel, Rathus, and Ruppert (1973), following up the work of Gordon et al., are also in close accord with the value stretch theory. Further research is needed, however, to test the alternative explanations in a more focused and explicit manner, with

attention to the differences that may depend upon the type of action or delinquency under consideration.

Neutralization and Value Stretch

A few contrasting illustrations can help to set this value stretch theory into context. One contrast is between "value stretch" theory and the "neutralization" theory of Sykes and Matza (1957). They found poverty-class delinquents to share the middle-class values, but to have developed neutralization techniques that enable them to engage in certain delinquent acts without guilt. These techniques permit the delinquent to justify deviant behavior, by projecting blame upon others, for example, or by denying that anyone has been harmed. In contrast, Rodman refers to individuals who have stretched the dominant values so that they can hold the values of both classes simultaneously, albeit with a lowered level of commitment to these values.

The two theories show some similarity at the point where Sykes and Matza (see Matza, 1974) refer to the delinquent as uncommitted and Rodman refers to the low-income person as evidencing a low degree of commitment. The two theories overlap in the sense that both Matza and Rodman hold that the delinquent (or low-income individual) is able to act in either a nonconforming or a conforming

way, as judged by middle-class standards. But the theories diverge in that neutralization theory views the person as sharing the middle-class values, but drifting free of these values because of neutralizing techniques, while value stretch theory views that person as having a low degree of commitment to the values of each social class. Matza suggests that delinquents have stretched the range of extenuating circumstances which excuse a delinquent act while retaining the conventional values. Rodman suggests that individuals from poor backgrounds have stretched their range of values to include their own unique values while retaining the conventional values.

A similar contrast can be made between the value stretch concept and the concept of rationalization as it is used regarding desired family size. Population researchers point out that poor parents who have exceeded their desired family size may, through a process of rationalization, end up saying that they desire a larger number of children (e.g., Westoff & Ryder, 1970). One critical question is whether we are dealing with rationalization or with value modification. Another critical question is whether we need to address ourselves more directly and more consistently to the concept of a range of desired family size in the population field. What happens when

poor individuals, due to limited resources, realize that they will not be able to maintain the family size they desire? How do they react, in value terms? And what time schedule do these reactions follow; for example, are values modified (if they are modified) in anticipation of failure to maintain desired family size or after that failure?

Another interesting parallel between neutralization and value stretch theory is drawn by Furstenberg (1976, p. 45) in his discussion of the sexual standards and behavior of adolescent girls. As he puts it, low-income adolescent females have difficulty in resiting the strong pressure for sexual intercourse from males, and they "stretch their values" and/or adopt "techniques of neutralization" or rationalization. Further work in this area, to specify the different findings predicted by value stretch theory and by neutralization theory and to test them, would be helpful.

Returning to delinquency theory, Cohen and Short (1958) compare their idea of reaciton formation in the development of delinquency with the idea of neutralization. Reaction formation has an irrational component which would account for the ambivalence of the poor youth who is still influenced by middle-class values, and reaction formation

"is one of the most elementary techniques of neutralization." As they put it, "The formation of a subculture is itself probably the most universal and powerful of techniques of neutralization, for nothing is so effective in allaying doubts and providing moral reassurance against a gnawing superego as the repeated, empathtic, and articulate support and approval of other persons." (p. 22). By thus weaving the ideas of reaction formation and neutralization into the formation of a subculture they confront the key issue of value modification, and yet evade it. Discussions of the neutralization and rationalization techniques employed by poor people do not ordinarily assume value modification, and it is not entirely clear whether other investigators would accept the meaning that Cohen and Short attribute to neutralization. Clarification is necessary because it involves the nature of the predictions one would make from neutralization theory.

In testing Matza's neutralization theory, Hindelang (1974) makes the conventional interpretation of the theory--that it does not involve value modification. As a result he predicts that delinquents and nondelinquents would be equally disapproving of illegal behavior. But he finds a strong relationship between involvement in and approval of illegal behavior, contrary to the prediction

from neutralization theory. Hindelang's finding does conform to what we would predict from value stretch theory. In addition, value stretch theory would predict that the two groups are equally approving of items of legal behavior, something that Hindelang's study did not investigate.

Family and Community Variables

Although most of the sociological theories dealing with juvenile delinquency have included social class as an independent variable, a few, which can be termed "containment" theories, have also introduced the concept of control, both social and personal, as an intervening variable in the etiology of delinquency (Marshall, 1973). These theories suggest that delinquency is found when the social and personal controls (community organization, parental discipline, family ties), which usually discourage juvenile delinquency, break down.

Walter C. Reckless (1961) has made the most detailed exposition of control theory, and he has coined the phrase "containment theory." Reckless put special emphasis on social organization, in the family and in the community, as an important form of control for adolescents. Albert J. Reiss (1951), another containment theorist, hypothesized that institutional controls--the school and the condition

of the neighborhood--were most significant in controlling delinquency, while F. Ivan Nye (1958) pointed to the importance of stability, both in residential mobility and family interaction, as a control. Unlike the theories more exclusively concerned with social class, the containment theories pay a good deal of attention to family variables.

Another important way in which the family can be seen as an intervening variable between social class and delinquency has to do with the differential impact of the classes upon family organization and socialization techniques (Kohn, 1969). Families of lower socioeconomic status can be distinguished from families in the middle class not only a criteria such as occupation, education, and income, but also one child-rearing practices and family norms. Several studies, for instance, have pointed to the changes through time in the relative permissiveness of parents of each class (Bronfenbrenner, 1958; Caldwell, 1964). Furthermore, many researchers have pointed to the important effect that parental discipline and affection have on a child's development as a delinquent or nondelinquent (Glueck & Glueck, 1950, 1962; Nye, 1958; McCord & McCord, 1964), and these two variables are probably the most salient ones to consider. Bronfenbrenner (1958), in his summary of previous studies, concluded that discipline in low-status

families was more consistently physical, while in middle-class families it more consistently involved love - withdrawal; the latter turns out to be more effective. He also notes that middle-class families tend to be more egalitarian and accepting of their children, while the poor are more interested in maintaining order and obedience.

These differences in child-rearing practices by social class, coupled with the findings of such studies as the Gluecks' (1950), which showed a strong relationship between the parents' affection and disciplinary techniques on the one hand, and juvenile delinquency on the other, undoubtedly account for a significant amount of the variance in delinquency rates between social classes. As a result, the family's role in the etiology of delinquency is not limited to its placement of individuals in the social class structure, but also involves the nature of social relationships within the family.

A Paradigm for Delinquency

Based upon the published research and theoretical interpretations, the following is offered as a schematic paradigm for the etiology of delinquency, particularly for male gang delinquency in poor neighborhoods, when it does not reflect personality maladjustment. For an over-

lapping theoretical model, the reader is referred to Empey and Lubeck (1971a, 1971b). Although many references would be appropriate at each step of the paradigm, I shall generally list only a single reference. The stress that has been placed upon value stretch theory earlier is not continued in the paradigm, which addresses itself to a wider span of questions. These cover behavioral, attitudinal, and valuational consequences of community and family life for children of the poor and near-poor.

1. <u>The Community's Limited Ability To Provide Opportunities To Achieve in Accordance with Middle-Class Values</u>

Living in a poor community:

a. lessens legitimate opportunities and lessens the possibility of achievement in accordance with middle-class values (Cloward & Ohlin, 1960);
b. makes illegitimate or "delinquent" behavior likelier (Merton, 1957);
c. makes it likelier that groups or gangs will develop in which there is social support for delinquent behavior (Cohen, 1955);
d. leads to a discrepancy between middle-class values and actual behavior so that pressure is exerted to modify the middle-class values in some

way; this may take the form of reaction formation (Cohen, 1955), of neutralization (Sykes & Matza, 1957), of value stretch (Rodman, 1963), or of a completely separate culture in which the middle-class values are not taken as a baseline (Miller, 1958).

One result is that groups with modified values, such as delinquent gangs, are likelier to arise in less affluent communities.

2. The Family's and Community's Limited Ability To Maintain External Controls

Growing up in a poor family involves:

a. social, economic, and occupational deprivation (by definition);

b. lesser attraction for the family, and for one's father, given the emphasis that is placed upon the man's occupational position and earning power (Gold, 1963; Rodman, 1971);

c. a lower concept of personal and family worth (Reckless, 1961);

d. a lesser ability of parents, stemming from limited resources which make the manipulation of rewards and punishments more difficult, to maintain external controls over their children, especially in anonymous urban areas (H. Lewis, 1965);

e. a lesser degree of attractiveness of community agencies--for example, schools--and therefore their lesser ability to maintain external controls (Toby, 1957).

Therefore, individuals less subject to external controls are likelier to come from families who are not financially secure.

3. The Family's Limited Use of Child-Rearing Techniques that Lead to Effective Internal Controls

Living in a low-income family involves:

a. more family disharmony and instability, stemming from the members', and especially from the father's, greater difficulty in fulfilling expected roles (Rodman, 1971);

b. a greater likelihood of lax or inconsistent discipline and of discipline focused upon the child's actions rather than intentions, stemming in part from the constraining situation represented by available occupations (Kohn, 1969);

c. a lesser degree of affection within the family, stemming from the pressures imposed upon the family by the need to adapt to deprived circumstances (Nye, 1958);

d. a lesser degree of identification with parents or of internalization of parental norms (McCord & McCord, 1959).

One result is that individuals less subject to conventional internal controls are likelier to come from such families.

Thus, according to section (1) of the paradigm, the poor community's limited ability to provide opportunities to achieve in accordance with middle-class values makes it more likely that delinquent gangs with modified values will arise. According to section (2), low status directly influences the family's (and the community's) transactions with its children because of the lesser degree of attraction it has for them. According to section (3), such status indirectly influences the family's tranactions with its children because of its influence over the child-rearing techniques that are used. As a result of the lower degree of attraction for the family and of the kind of child-rearing techniques used, a greater proportion of children of these families are less subject to conventional personal and family controls. The overall result is that, within the poor community, there are more individuals who frequently interact in gangs, who behave in ways that are not highly evaluated by middle-class values, and who have modified the middle-class values such that the gang provides support and status for its members.

Discussion

What we have covered in the above paradigm centers specifically upon low-income families, communities, gangs, and delinquency. It helps us to understand the higher rate of official delinquency in poor communities, but it does not specifically address itself to variations within these communities. It is only by inferring the differential availability of opportunities, or the differential attractiveness of families or of affection within parent/child relationships, that we can begin to deal with such variation

The above paradigm also does not address itself directly to middle-class delinquency. Gold (1963) has suggested that some of the same factors that lead to delinquency among the poor may also account for middle-class delinquency; this would principally involve the child-rearing variables listed in section (3), although such matters as lax discipline or low affection within middle-class families would presumably stem from something other than deprived circumstances.

The paradigm is of course, highly tentative, and is presented merely as a way of coordinating some of the theories and data in the delinquency literature. But it is virtually the same paradigm that was presented 10 years

ago (Rodman & Grams, 1967), reflecting the slow growth of scientific knowledge about delinquency. In time, no doubt, as additional data and theoretical explanations become available, modifications will convert the lossely organized paradigm into a more tightly conceived theoretical system.

References

Bordua, D. J. Delinquent subcultures: Sociological interpretations of gang delinquency. Annals, 1961, 338, 119-136.

Bordua, D. J. Some comments on theories of gang delinquency. Sociological Inquiry, 1962, 32, 245-250.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Socialization and social class through time and space. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, 1958.

Caldwell, B. M. The effects of infant care. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. New York: Ruseell Sage Foundation, 1964.

Chester, C. R. Perceived relative deprivation as a cause of property crime. Crime and Delinquency, 1976, 22, 197-30.

Cloward, R. A., & Ohlin, L. E. Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960.

Cohen, A. K. Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

Cohen, A. K., & Short, J. F., Jr. Research in delinquent subcultures. Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14, 20-36.

Deutscher, I. What we say/what we do. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1973.

Downes, D. M. The delinquent solution: A study of subculture theory. New York: Free Press, 1966.

Empey, L. T., & Lubeck, S. G. Explaining delinquency. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1971a.

Empey, L. T., & Lubeck, S. G. The Silverlake experiment. Chicago: Aldine, 1971b.

Flango, V. E., & Sherbenou, E. L. Poverty, urbanization, and crime. Criminology, 1976, 14, 331-345.

Frease, D. E. Delinquency, social class, and the schools. Sociology and Social Research, 1973, 57, 443-459.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr. Unplanned parenthood. New York: Free Press, 1976.

Gibbs, J. P., & Erickson, M. L. Major developments in the sociological study of deviance. Annual Review of Sociology, 1975, 1, 21-42.

Glueck, D., & Glueck, E. Unraveling juvenile delinquency. New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1950.

Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. Family environment and delinquency. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962.

Gold, M. Status forces in delinquent boys. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1963.

Gordon, R. A., Short, J. F., Cartwright, D. S., & Strodtbeck, F. L. Values and gang delinquency: A study of street corner groups. American Journal of Sociology, 1963, 69, 109-128.

Harry, J. Social class and delinquency: One more time. The Sociological Quarterly, 1974, 15, 294-301.

Hindelang, M. J. Moral evaluations of illegal behaviors. Social Problems, 1974, 21, 370-385.

Kelly, D. H., & Pink, W. T. Status origins, youth rebellion, and delinquency: A reexamination of the class issue. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1975, 4, 339-347.

Kobrin, S. The conflict of values in delinquency areas. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 653-661.

Kohn, M. L. Class and conformity: A study in values. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1969.

Leacock, E. B. (Ed.). The culture of poverty: A critique. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971.

Lewis, H. Child-rearing among low-income families. In L. A. Ferman, J. L. Kornbluh, & A. Haber (Eds.), Poverty in America. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.

Lewis, O. The culture of poverty. Scientific American, 1966, 215, 19-25.

Lewis, O. A study of slum culture. New York: Random House, 1968.

Marshall, T. F. An investigation of the delinquency self-concept theory of Reckless and Dinitz. British Journal of Criminology, 1973, 13, 227-236.

Matza, D. Delinquency and drift. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Mays, J. B. Crime and its treatment. London: Longman, 1970.

McCord, D., & McCord, J. Origins of crime. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

McCord, J., & McCord, W. The effects of parental role model on criminality. In R. Cavan (Ed.), Readings in juvenile delinquency. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1964.

McDonald, L. Social class and delinquency. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1969.

Merton, R. K. Social theory and social structure (2nd ed.). Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957.

Miles, A. P. Social theory, civil rights, and crime. Crime and Delinquency, 1973, 19, 394-405.

Miller, W. B. Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14, 5-19.

Nye, F. I. Family relationships and delinquent behavior. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Reckless, W. C. The crime problem (3rd ed.). New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1961.

Reiss, A. J., Jr. Delinquency as the failure of personal and social controls. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 196-207.

Reiss, A. J., & Rhodes, A. L. Status deprivation and delinquent behavior. Sociological Quarterly, 1963, 4, 135-149.

Rodman, H. The lower-class value stretch. Social Forces, 1963, 42, 205-215.

Rodman, H. Illegitimacy in the Carribbean social structure: A reconsideration. American Sociological Review, 1966, 31, 673-683.

Rodman, H. Controversies about lower-class culture: Delinquency and illegitimacy. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 1968, 5, 254-262.

Rodman, H. Lower-class families: The culture of poverty in Negro Trinidad. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Rodman, H., & Grams, P. Juvenile delinquency and the family: A review and discussion. Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Washington, D.C.: President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967, 188-221.

Rodman, H., Voydanoff, P., & Lovejoy, A. E. The range of aspirations: A new approach. Social Problems, 1974, 22, 184-198.

Short, J. F., Jr., & Strodtbeck, F. L. Group process and gang delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Siegel, L. J., Rathus, S. A., & Ruppert, C. A. Values and delinquent youth: An empirical re-examination of theories of delinquency. British Journal of Criminology, 1973, 13, 237-244.

Spergel, I. Racketville, Slumtown, Haulburg. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Stokes, R., & Hewitt, J. P. Aligning actions. American Sociological Review, 1976, 41, 838-849.

Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 664-670.

Toby, J. Social disorganization and stake in conformity. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1957, 48, 12-17.

Valentine, C. Culture and poverty: critique and counter-proposals. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Westoff, C. F., & Ryder, N. B. Contraceptive practice among urban blacks in the United States, 1965. Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, 1970, 48, 215-239.